REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for reviewing and considering the present application. Applicants also express gratitude to the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and confirming receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. In addition, Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the material cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of May 10, 2005. The Office Action dated January 14, 2008, has been received and reviewed.

Claims 1 and 6 are hereby amended. Claims 1-12 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Office asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation of "other networks" in claim 4 and 10, respectively. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that the recitation of "other networks" is not indefinite and does not contain words or phrases whose meaning is unclear. Applicants submit that there is no prior recitation of "other networks," which would make the meaning of this term unclear in claims 4 and 10. Moreover, Applicants submit that support for the recitation of "other networks," as recited in claims 4 and 10, can be found in at least page 10 of Applicants' original specification. *See* MPEP 2173.05(e). Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 4 and 10.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,471,190 (hereinafter *Zimmermann*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for setting a home code of a home network system having a first adaptor connected with a network managing unit, and second adaptors connected to the first adaptor through a power line or by wireless and respectively connected with appliances, the method comprising, *inter alia*, "creating the home code of the first adaptor...if the home code is not duplicated, setting the home code of the first adaptor to the second adaptors, wherein the first adaptor corresponds to the network managing unit that manages the appliances." *Zimmerman* fails to disclose at least these features, as recited.

Zimmerman discloses a control communication network system adapted for distributed control and communication between various home electrical appliances in a manner that eliminates the need for a central controller. *See Zimmerman* at Abstract. An objective of *Zimmerman* is to "change the architecture of the traditional remote control network from one based on a central controller (i.e., hub and spoke system or master and slave system) to a system composed of a plurality of intelligent decision-making 'peer' nodes and not requiring any central controller." *See Zimmerman* at Figures 1-2, as well as at column 2, lines 50-55. As such, *Zimmerman* clearly teaches away from, *inter alia*, a "network managing unit that manages the appliances" and "a first adaptor," as recited in Applicants' claims.

Independent claim 6 recites a method for setting a home code of a home network system having a first adaptor connected with a network managing unit, and second adaptors connected to the first adaptor through a power line or by wireless and connected with each of a plurality of appliances, the method comprising, *inter alia*, "transmitting a home code create command to the first adaptor from the network managing unit according to a user's command, the network managing unit managing the plurality of appliances." *Zimmerman* fails to disclose at least these features, as recited.

As aforementioned, *Zimmerman* discloses a control communication network system adapted for distributed control and communication between various home electrical appliances in a manner that eliminates the need for a central controller. *See Zimmerman* at Abstract. An objective of *Zimmerman* is to "change the architecture of the traditional remote control network from one based on a central controller (i.e., hub and spoke system or master and slave system) to a system composed of a plurality of intelligent decision-making 'peer' nodes and not requiring any central controller." *See Zimmerman* at Figures 1-2, as well as at column 2, lines 50-55. As such, *Zimmerman* clearly teaches away from, *inter alia*, a "network managing unit that manages the appliances" and "a first adaptor," as recited in Applicants' claims.

Furthermore, as *Zimmerman* fails to disclose a "network managing unit," *Zimmerman* also fails to disclose or suggest a method comprising, *inter alia*, "transmitting a home code create command to the first adaptor from the network managing unit according to a user's command," as recited. Instead, *Zimmerman* discloses a "learn/teach" toggle switch 15 in which the module comes out of the teach/learn mode such that the microprocessor is functional via its program to determine that the module has no house code or unit code. Consequently, the microprocessor makes up its own code 17. *See Zimmerman* at column 6, lines 20-24. In other words, *Zimmerman* discloses a microprocessor that makes up its own code based on a mode, which is activated by a switch. As such, *Zimmerman* teaches away from a home code create command transmittal, as recited in Applicants' claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over *Zimmerman* and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 3-5, and 7, 9-12, which depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, are also patentable for at least the

same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of claims 1, 3-7, and 9-12.

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,471,190 (hereinafter *Zimmermann*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that *Zimmermann*, taken singularly or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in the claims.

As previously discussed, Applicants respectfully submit that *Zimmerman* fails to disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 6, respectively. For example, *Zimmerman* fails to disclose or suggest a method for setting a home code of a home network system having a first adaptor connected with a network managing unit, and second adaptors connected to the first adaptor through a power line or by wireless and respectively connected with appliances, the method comprising, *inter alia*, "creating the home code of the first adaptor...setting the home code of the first adaptor to the second adaptors, wherein the first adaptor corresponds to the network managing unit that manages the appliances," as recited in independent claim 1. *Zimmerman* also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, "transmitting a home code create command to the first adaptor from the network managing unit according to a user's command, the network managing unit managing the plurality of appliances," as recited in independent claim 6.

In addition, Applicants submit that *Zimmerman* fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the subject matter of claims 2 and 8, respectively. For example, in setting forth the rejection, the Office admits that *Zimmerman* fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, that the "house code is

9

generated by combining a timing count value and an initial code value of the first adaptor." *See* Office Action at page 6. The Office thus takes "official notice." *See* Office Action at page 6. Applicants disagree with the Office's unsupported assertions. Applicants thus challenge the Office's assertion of official notice and request supporting evidence that a "home code" is created by "combining a timing count value and an initial code value of the first adaptor," as recited in claim 2, and that a "home code of the first adaptor is created by combining a timing count value and an initial code value of the first adaptor," as recited in claim 8. *See* MPEP 2144.03.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over *Zimmermann* and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2 and 8, which depend from claims 1 and 6, are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 2 and 8.

CONCLUSION

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicants' representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any

overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: <u>April 3, 2008</u>   Respectfully submitted,

By____/Michael I. Angert #46522/___
   Michael I. Angert
   Registration No.: 46,522
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant